

## Message

**From:** Kay, Robert [rtkay@usgs.gov]  
**Sent:** 10/15/2015 3:52:28 PM  
**To:** Nordine, John [nordine.john@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** Techalloy Sept. 2015 Monthly Progress Report

John--I have reviewed the September 2015 Monthly Progress Report for the Techalloy Facility in Union, Illinois. I have a few comments.

General Comment on submission--the laboratory results for the effluent sampling need to be provided.

Monthly Progress Report--minor comment, but table numbers should be in the order referenced in the text (1,2,3...). Table references here are 1,3,4, 2.

Minor comment, but the naming of the extraction wells relative to figure 1 is a bit confusing in the text. Text should clearly note the groundwater extraction wells are wells EW-1 and EW-2 and are shown in figure 1.

A paragraph or two that actually discusses the VOC concentrations at wells EW-1 and EW-2 should be provided.

The text seems to indicate that the "0" values for 1,1-DCE and cis-1,2-DCE prior to March 2013 at well EW-1 should be changed to "-", or something else that indicates "not analyzed". The graphs for wells EW-1 and EW-2 and the associated data table for well EW-1 indicate (apparently inaccurately) the analyses were done, and that the results came back as non-detects. This presentation of the data indicates trends in the concentration of these analytes that are not present--at least not to the degree indicated by the tables and graphs. Autumwood needs to revise table 4 and the associated plots to accurately depict what data is available, when, for what analyses.

A well (or anything else) should be described using the same name throughout the report to avoid confusion. Well EW-1 is referred to as "Well 1" in table 4 and "P&T Influent Well 1" in the data plot and "Extraction well 1" in the text. This issue also applies for well EW-2. Pick a name and use it consistently.

Table 2, from what I can tell the effluent limitation for TCA, TCE, and PCE is 20 micrograms per liter, not the described 20 milligrams per liter. The table needs to be corrected. This error appears to be present (and I didn't realize it) in all of the previous submissions. For the umpteenth time Autumwood needs to check the accuracy of their submissions.

Table 3, water-level data--the text describes water levels being 6.35 ft below top of casing on August 31, 2015 and 6.74 ft on October 5, 2015. This means a verified change in water level of 0.39 ft during this time span. Table 3 does not provide water levels before September 1, 2015, so the accuracy of the transducer data cannot be verified from this submission. Future submissions should include transducer data covering both of the tape-down measurement periods so the accuracy of the data can be verified. Future submission also should note the time of the measurement, not just the date. I checked the water-level data from the August 2015 submission and the changes in water level shown by the transducer seem reasonable.

--

Robert T. Kay  
 U.S. Geological Survey

650G Peace Road  
DeKalb, IL 60115  
815-752-2041  
[rtkay@usgs.gov](mailto:rtkay@usgs.gov)